



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

---

### PALESTINIAN ARCHAEOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

Although the war has put a stop for the present to all organized excavation of Palestine, a not inconsiderable amount of work has been done in furthering the progress of Palestinian archaeology. The material accumulated in the past brought with it many difficult problems, and one is sometimes inclined to believe that what is needed is not an ever-increasing store of evidence, but more critical and more synthetic methods of handling that which already lies to hand. It is true that new evidence may definitely settle disputed questions, but only methodical study teaches the archaeologist what to look for, what theories to test, and what lines of inquiry to pursue. Certainly a very great deal remains to be done in the archaeology of Palestine, and a welcome must be extended to every contribution to the subject. Mr. Handcock's book aims at presenting "some account of the arts, crafts, manners, and customs of the inhabitants of Palestine from the earliest times down to the Roman period." The writer, formerly assistant in the department of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities of the British Museum, is one of the authorized lecturers for the Palestine Exploration Fund, and has produced other books on oriental archaeology. Here he has not attempted to give any history of the excavations, nor does he combine the biblical and archaeological evidence and use the one to illustrate the other; not biblical archaeology, but the archaeology of Palestine on the basis of the excavations is his field, and he succeeds in furnishing a competent introductory handbook which will form a useful supplement to the growing list of works that directly or indirectly handle this subject.<sup>2</sup>

After a brief prefatory chapter Mr. Handcock describes the caves and rock cuttings, and the architecture (the latter an important chapter);

<sup>1</sup> *The Archaeology of the Holy Land.* By P. S. P. Handcock. New York: Macmillan, 1916. 384 pages. \$3.00.

<sup>2</sup> Compare, e.g., Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie* (2d ed., 1907); Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder* (Vol. II, 1909); Driver, *Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible* (Schweich Lectures for 1908); P. Thomsen, *Kompendium der palästinischen Altertumskunde* (1913; small, but rich in bibliographical information). To these must now be added Barton's *Archaeology and the Bible*.

he then proceeds to a description of objects, classified according to their material (flint, bone, ivory, and stone; metals; pottery; terra-cotta). There is an interesting account of burial customs and a useful concluding chapter on "Worship and Places of Worship." The book is well illustrated with nearly one hundred and forty plates, figures, and plans; it has been conscientiously prepared, it is clearly written, and it gives the reader a good introduction to the more serious technical problems which at once arise. For these Father Vincent's admirable work on *Canaan after Recent Exploration* (reviewed in the *AJTh*, XII, 1908, 471-74), and his articles in the *Revue Biblique*, together with the critical discussions of Hermann Thiersch, are indispensable; but there is always need for convenient, up-to-date introductions such as Mr. Handcock's, and the author has taken good care to utilize all the published works on the most recent excavations. Consequently Gezer, Samaria, Jericho, Beth-shemesh, etc., find a place here, and special prominence is given to Macalister's voluminous work on Gezer, which is described as "by far the most important contribution that has been made to the science of Palestinian Archaeology," and "an inexhaustible mine of information upon which all students of the subject will be largely dependent for many years to come."

Mr. Handcock writes as an enthusiastic archaeologist. Unfortunately this has led him in his opening sentences to an extremely rash contrast between "ordinary history" and the "incontrovertible and concrete facts" of material culture, etc. (p. 17). It is necessary, therefore, to remind ourselves of the wise words of Hogarth, who protests against the "invidious comparison between the sound objective evidence of material documents and the unsound subjective evidence of literature"; for, as he says, "neither is the latter any less objective than the former, nor is the former less open to subjective falsification than the latter."<sup>1</sup> The truth is, of course, that the material objects inevitably need an interpretation and a historical setting, and the history of archaeological research is enough to show that they do not always bear their plain meaning upon their face. Indeed, the necessity of a delicate criticism and co-ordination of both the traditional (written) evidence and the archaeological is abundantly shown in all discussion of the chronological and archaeological periods; and here it is surely impossible to agree with Mr. Handcock when he dates the Fifth Dynasty of Egypt "perhaps about 3600 B.C." (p. 102), and ascribes the beginning of the

<sup>1</sup> See his *Authority and Archaeology*, p. ix; cf. also the present reviewer's *Study of Religions*, pp. 51 ff.

Hellenistic archaeological period in Palestine as early as "about 550 B.C." (p. 23). As regards details, it may be noticed that the spelling Aboughôch (Kirjath-jearim) on p. 282 is apparently taken from a French source, and stands for Abû Gôsh, that the unique "calendar inscription" from Gezer (pl. xviii) is printed upside down, and that on p. 178 the reference to Dr. G. A. Cooke is a slip (of a not unfamiliar type) for the present writer. Moreover, it is misleading to say that the Siloam inscription is written in "the old Hebrew characters which closely resemble those found on the Moabite stone" (p. 177, cf. p. 299); there are important differences, and it is a matter of dispute whether they are due to intervening centuries or to difference of material, style, environment, etc. The question of the date of the Siloam inscription and of the early history of Hebrew palaeography is of considerable importance for its bearing upon the inscribed jar handles which Mr. Pilcher and I associate with the Persian period.<sup>1</sup> It is extremely desirable that the subject should be kept steadily in view because if the jar handles are to be freely ascribed to this period, the result is significant for the more fundamental problems of the chronology of Palestinian archaeology.

Equally important, too, is the question of the "Philistine" graves (pp. 317 ff.). Here, on the one side, is the tendency to exaggerate the extent of "Philistine" influence upon the archaeology of Palestine and to find an early date for these graves; whereas, on the other side, the present writer, for one, is unable to repress the conviction that archaeological connections with Asia Minor need a fuller examination than they have received. Moreover, as regards date, three independent arguments can be cited for placing the graves well within the "Israelite" period. The first is the general archaeological argument of Mr. J. L. Myres (*Quart. St.*, 1907, pp. 240 ff.); the second, a very novel one, is the resemblance noticed by Mr. Pilcher between the contents of the graves and the goods mentioned in a Jewish fifth-century papyrus from Elephantine;<sup>2</sup> while, to crown it all, Mr. Leonard Woolley in a description of a North Syrian cemetery of the Persian period has recently pointed out the analogies between it and the graves.<sup>3</sup> If these cases are sufficient to illustrate some of the problems of "comparative archaeology," it will

<sup>1</sup> See Pilcher, *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Archaeol.*, XXXII (1910), 93 ff., 143 ff.; Cook, *Quarterly Statement of the Pal. Explor. Fund*, 1909, pp. 291 ff.; cf. also F. W. Read, *ibid.*, 1910, pp. 232 ff., "the Persian and Egyptian affinities of the Jewish Royal Pottery Stamps."

<sup>2</sup> Viz., the marriage-contract G, see *AJTh*, XIX (1915), 355.

<sup>3</sup> *Annals of Arch. and Anthropol.* (University of Liverpool), VII (1916), 128.

be understood why all the more fundamental problems are found to be interconnected. Thus Crete, Asia Minor, Turkestan, Elam, Babylonia, and Egypt become full of meaning for the archaeology of Palestine; and extremely complex questions, combining archaeological and historical factors, prove to be of unusual importance for all our conceptions of life and thought in Palestine.<sup>1</sup>

It is small wonder that, as these researches progress, the work of the biblical and theological scholar becomes more arduous. Approaching the Bible from the outside, the field of external evidence, one is often struck with the narrow outlook of the ordinary biblical scholar or student; while, on the other hand, only the trained student can realize that biblical criticism is a severe discipline, and that promiscuous combinations of biblical and external evidence are unmethodical and mischievous. However highly one may rank the external or archaeological point of view, it must always be borne in mind that the external evidence in itself neither brings unanimity of conclusion among its champions nor, it must be said, reflects unanimity of method. Now, there are two especially vital questions for every biblical student upon which Palestinian archaeology has a voice, and it may be useful to conclude this notice with the briefest reference to them. The first is the absence of any gap or break in the cultural history, such as might have been anticipated had there been an Israelite conquest on the lines described in the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup> The second is more novel, but, if I am not mistaken, is of a sweeping character and has very drastic consequences: it is the appearance of a cultural deterioration which suggests some historical factor. Instead of the archaeological break which the biblical history would suggest in the pre-monarchical period (*viz.*, the Israelite invasion), there is a *later* deterioration upon which the history seems at first to be silent. It seems quite impossible to associate this deterioration with the Israelite entrance (Sellin) or with the growth of national independence under the monarchy (Vincent).<sup>3</sup> Already a relatively late date for the feature had been fixed by Petrie (*Tell el-Hesy*, pp. 47 ff.), and also by Bliss and

<sup>1</sup> Note, for example, Peake, "Racial Elements Concerned in the First Siege of Troy" (*Journ. of the Royal Anthropol. Inst.* XLVI [1916], especially 168 ff., where the chronology of Western Asia is involved); also the recent publication of the Berlin *Mitt. Deutsch. Orient. Gesell.*, December, 1915, No. 56 ("Indo-European Elements in Asia Minor and Syria").

<sup>2</sup> Reference may be made to my remarks in the review of Vincent's book, *AJT*, XII (1908), 473.

<sup>3</sup> Sellin, *Ertrag der Ausgrabungen*, 1905, pp. 27, 37 (cf. *Quart. Stat.*, 1904, p. 123); Vincent, *Canaan*, 1907, pp. 344 ff., 352 ff.

Macalister, who observed that it overlaps with the Seleucid period (*Excavations*, pp. 72, 74, 101, 124). In fact, the data belong to a period contemporary with the jar handles and immediately below strata with distinctively Hellenistic and later indications (e.g., Rhodian stamps, Jewish ossuaries). Consequently, on purely archaeological grounds the significant deterioration may be placed nearer the close than the beginning of "Israelite" history.

Now this conclusion, which of course needs a careful working out, is in practical harmony with other lines of evidence. First and foremost, because of the objective character of the testimony, must be noticed the drastic dislocation and disorganization of conditions due to the Assyrian conquests.<sup>1</sup> The deportations, the breaking up of the earlier solidarity and culture, and especially the importation of new colonies, must have had the most serious effect upon the whole life and thought of the areas concerned. Everyone knows the biblical evidence for the new colonization, but few seem to weigh the full meaning of the extremely interesting fact that Sargon in 715-14 introduced into Samaria desert tribes (Tamud, Ibadid, Marsiman, Haiapa, and Arbai [?Arabians]).<sup>2</sup> In addition to these internal changes, the next century witnessed important movements east of the Jordan.<sup>3</sup> Still later come the fall of Judah and the exile, and to this period scholars have independently ascribed a movement of semi-Arabian clans northward from the negeb of Judah.<sup>4</sup> Hence in a variety of ways there were vicissitudes quite sufficient to account for cultural deterioration; and if the biblical account of the invading Israelites finds no justification in archaeology, archaeology, in turn, presents just the features which a critical view of the history of Israel leads us to expect, namely, the absence of any drastic change in the pre-monarchical period and the traces of one at or about the time of the downfall of the monarchies. It is very necessary that the points should be carefully considered, because all the vicissitudes which, on the ordinary view, apparently occurred at the Israelite invasion would recur,

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 35, 71, 79, 256, 258, 358, 472, and note especially p. 65: "The age of Assyrian conquest proved as critical for religious as for civil history, for from that time forward the old religion was quite out of touch with the actualities of social life . . . . in the eighth century B.C. the national religion of the northern Semites had already passed its prime and was sinking into decadence."

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Paton, *Syria and Palestine*, p. 248; Montgomery, *Samaritans*, p. 51.

<sup>3</sup> Paton, *op. cit.*, p. 269; see Winckler, *Keilinschr. u. d. Alte Test.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 151, who significantly speaks of "eine Wiederholung der Einwanderung Israels selbst."

<sup>4</sup> So, after Wellhausen (*de gentibus Judaeis*, 1870), G. F. Moore (*Encyc. Biblica*, col. 630), Curtis (*Chronicles*, p. 89 ff.), and many others.

*mutatis mutandis*, centuries later when the post-monarchical conditions would bear some resemblance to the pre-monarchical, and when nomad or semi-nomad peoples settled in Samaria and in the vicinity of Jerusalem. That is to say, a similar situation recurred, first when the Israelites entered, and later when other and in some respects rather similar nomad tribes entered into occupation; and just as the colonists in Samaria came to be regarded as Israelite, so, elsewhere, immigrants would identify themselves with the traditions of the land. It follows therefore that those biblical sources which are posterior to the great period of dislocation and disorganization may purport to deal in all sincerity with the pre-monarchical invasion and conquest, but the fact remains that at a relatively recent date the ancestors of the writers may have entered the land and have occupied great and goodly cities which they had not built, and vineyards and olive yards which they had not planted. In other words, late accounts of the Israelite invasion and settlement need an entire reconsideration in the light of the late disorganization and immigration of colonists.

It is to be remembered that *on any theory* the eighth and immediately following centuries are a turning-point for the history of Palestine and Western Asia, and, therefore, also for the critical view of the Old Testament (cf. *AJTh*, XIII (1909), 387). On literary-historical grounds we have to work back from the post-exilic reorganization. We have to recognize the mixed ancestry of both Samaritans and Judeans.<sup>1</sup> Hence we have to allow for a "composite history" in the Old Testament: the fusion of traditions of peoples who could have had different perspectives of the past. It is unmethodical, therefore, to throw into the waste-basket historical notices and glosses which conflict with our conceptions of the course of history, for, as it now becomes clear, vitally different points of view are only to be expected. Moreover, it is obvious that it is dangerous to seek to force some *orderly* development of religious thought from the entrance of the Israelites to the time of the Priestly Code, because in the very midst of such a development we have to allow for the break-up of the old culture of the monarchies, and the stages leading up to that which flourished in the Persian, Hellenistic, and later periods. This is not the place to refer further to points which, if sound, involve a serious revolutionizing of our conceptions of the Old Testament, and enough has been said, perhaps, to emphasize the fact that Palestinian archaeology is not to be neglected by the biblical student, that its theories and conclusions require careful testing, that where the archaeologist and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. P. Smith, *Old Test. Hist.*, p. 354, n. 1; Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, p. 328, n. 53.

the "critic" disagree there can be no presumption that the former rather than the latter is in the right, and that what is throughout requisite is a sane, healthy, and strenuous criticism of both.<sup>1</sup>

STANLEY A. COOK

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

---

### BABYLONIAN AND ASSYRIAN MYTHOLOGY<sup>2</sup>

The names Babylonia and Assyria have always been suggestive of fascinating mystery to the popular mind, and the volume under review represents another attempt to play upon this rather false interpretation of two ancient peoples and to present their myths and legends in popular and romantic form. Like others of its kind, it has not succeeded in this particularly well, for, after all, the Babylonians and Assyrians were no more wonderful nor in their life more mysterious than others of their day. They were men and women after the general order of their kind.

The title of the volume is just a trifle misleading. Although most of the myths and legends of the Babylonians and Assyrians are rather fully presented, in paraphrase rather than in translation, the book is after all more largely a discussion of the religion of these two peoples. The author has given his readers a fairly good presentation of that religion, but it requires more than the description of gods, temples, cults, myths, and legends to make a subject of this kind particularly attractive to the general public. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the book is one whit more interesting in its recital than many books in the field that are the work of specialists, and it was just this that the volume was intended to popularize. Jastrow, for instance, in many of his works writes in quite as interesting a way and is a thousand times more accurate.

The present volume, despite its good features, lacks what all popularizations of a technical subject by one who is not a specialist always lack—accuracy. Assyriology is too new a field and still too largely in

<sup>1</sup> On the archaeological and biblical points here touched upon reference may be made in the first instance to the *English Hist. Rev.*, April, 1908, pp. 320 ff.; the *Expositor*, August, 1909, pp. 97-114; the *Ency. Brit.*<sup>11</sup>, XI, 584 ff.; XV, 387, 389 ff.; XVI, 513 ff.; XX, 615 ff.; and my notes on I Esdras in Charles's *Apoc. and Pseudepig.*, pp. 12 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Myths and Legends of Babylonia and Assyria.* By Lewis Spence. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1917. 412 pages. \$3.00.